

Remarks/Arguments

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed November 17, 2005. In this Office Action, the Examiner objected to FIG. 1 of the drawings. Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 6-9 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. Further, the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Elabd (US Pat. No. 6,526,462).

1. Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to FIG. 1 of the drawings. Applicant is submitting a new sheet containing an amended FIG. 1 with this Office Action Response. In particular, the Applicant has added the legend "Prior Art" as requested by the Examiner. The Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to FIG. 1 of the drawings.

2. Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112, 2nd Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 6-9 under 35 USC 112, 2nd Paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant is canceling those claims in this amendment. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 6-9 under 35 USC 112, 2nd Paragraph.

3. Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Elabd (US Pat. No. 6,526,462). After reviewing the Office Action and the Examiner's comments, the Applicant is amending the claims to better clarify the claimed invention.

The Examiner found that Elabd shows and teaches all of the elements of the claimed invention. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner and finds that Elabd is not a proper 102(e) reference because it does not contain all of the elements of Applicant's claimed invention.

Elabd describes a highly intelligent programmable multi-tasking memory management system manages memory requests associated with a system on chip (SOC) device. The memory management system includes a routing controller or central processing unit (RCPU) that is used for routing/switching stream data between communication cores and digital signal processors with minimum reliance and demand on a main or virtual central processing unit (VCPU) residing on a system bus. Tasks are partitioned between the VCPU and the RCPU within the SOC architecture for communication applications. The VCPU performs system/application tasks while the RCPU simultaneously performs multiple memory routing/switching tasks and multiple concurrent memory access connections. The memory management system also enables other processors and communication cores to update their internal data once new data is written in the memory system. In addition, a method and system are provided for performing predictive protocol fetch for multiple DSPs on the SOC to increase data processing throughput.

The claimed invention, on the other hand, describes a System-on-Chip (SOC) interconnection method and apparatus that discloses an internal switching fabric that interconnects, via standard connection ports, one or more requestors and one or more addressable targets on a single semiconductor integrated circuit. Each target has a unique address space, may or may not have internal arbitration, and may be resident (i.e., on-chip) memory, a memory controller for resident or off-chip memory, an addressable bridge to a device, system, or subsystem, or any combination thereof. Targets and requestors are connected to the internal switching fabric using target and requestor connection ports. The internal switching fabric routes signals between requestors and targets using one or more decoder/router elements that determine which target is the designated target using an internal system memory map. Dedicated arbiters may be included for targets without internal arbitration.

Since the amended claims include elements and limitations that are not shown, taught, or implied by the Elabd, Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the claim rejections to claims 1-15 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Elabd (US Pat. No. 6,526,462)

4. Summary

In view of the above, Applicant believes that each of the presently pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance or appeal. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding objections and rejections of the claims and issue a timely Notice of Allowance in this case.

Date: 5/12/2006

Respectfully submitted,
/Matthew J Booth/
Matthew J. Booth
Reg. No. 35,454

Matthew J. Booth
Matthew J. Booth & Associates, PLLC
PO Box 50010
Austin, Texas 78763-0010
Telephone: (512) 474-8488
Facsimile: (512) 474-7996
matthew.booth@boothlaw.com
<http://www.boothlaw.com/>

Replacement Drawing Sheet(s)